

1 And that means you also may have missed my indications, you
2 have three minutes to speak, I'll put up one finger when you
3 have one minute left, and a closed hand when your time is
4 up.

5 MS. MEYER: Okay, great. Thank you.

6 I'm Kelly Meyer, and I do work with the
7 environmental organizations, but I'm really here tonight as
8 a concerned citizen and a mother. And if my phone rings,
9 it's because it's my kids calling me to come home and put
10 them to bed. But I felt it was important to weigh in
11 tonight.

12 And I understand that LNG -- the LNG facility
13 could ultimately bring us a source of cleaner energy, and
14 I'm all for that. And I'm a fan of Ed Begley, I'm a fan of
15 the Sierra Club.

16 But I think it also poses a possible threat to our
17 ocean habitat, which is equally as important as our air
18 quality.

19 But, most importantly, I think that we need to
20 understand, as citizens, and send a message to our local,
21 and State, and national governments, that the environmental
22 commons are not for sale.

23 We need to understand that this project affects
24 all of us long-term, and we need to know what that means,
25 and more time to figure out what that means for all of us.

T001-28.1

Section 4.7.4 describes potential Project impacts on the ocean habitat. Section 4.6 contains information on air quality.

T001-28.2

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

COMMENTER
T001-28

T001-28.1

T001-28.2

1 And if for no other reason, we need to make a
2 stand against fast-tracking business opportunities, without
3 the real concern for the people and the environment in their
4 paths.

5 And I'm not an engineer, and I'm not a scientist,
6 I'm not an expert in any way on this subject. I just
7 have -- I've got -- and I want to help, be a part of a wise
8 decision that will have a good long-term effect for all of
9 us.

10 And so I just want to ask all of you guys, as
11 citizens, to keep activated and on top of this debate, and
12 discussion, and I want to ask you all, as businessmen, and
13 part of our community, to look inside yourselves to really
14 help make the right decision for all of us.

15 Thanks.

16 (Applause.)

17 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next speaker is Neal
18 Michaelis.

19 MR. MICHAELIS: I am Neal Michaelis, I am a
20 resident, a Coastal resident. I live up by County Line
21 Beach, which is probably the closest area to where this
22 thing will be constructed, if it is constructed.

23 I haven't had a chance to read the draft EIS/EIR,
24 yet. I've looked it over a little bit. So I can't give a
25 detailed comment at this point. A lot of good points have

T001-28.2
(cont'd)

T001-28.3

T001-28.3

Section 1.1 discusses regulations and agencies involved in the licensing and potential approval of the proposed Project. The USCG and MARAD will hold a final public hearing on the license with a 45-day comment period before the Federal Record of Decision is issued. The CSLC also will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease.

Section 1.5 contains additional information regarding public notification and opportunities for public comment.

COMMENTER
T001-29

1 been brought up about the safety.

2 Primarily, I'd like to express, to those of you
3 who are involved in making the decision on this, that I'm
4 concerned that there's maybe undue influence from -- well,
5 Australia, primarily.

6 They're -- you are not responsible to them. You
7 are responsible to the citizens, and our safety, as well as
8 the marine habitat.

9 Trade with Australia, good relations with
10 Australia, that is, frankly, irrelevant to the decision-
11 making, in my opinion, on this matter, which is our safety,
12 the people who live here, the citizens. You are beholden to
13 us and the environment here.

14 We have a beautiful marine environment. There's
15 whales, there's dolphins. It's a wonderful place, here, and
16 the risks are great to this.

17 Any industrial operation of this size has risks,
18 it is not fail-safe. Exxon Valdez is a great example. Yet,
19 again, off the Coast of Spain, huge industrial disaster.

20 No matter how good the technology there is, and
21 how good the engineers involved, there are accidents that do
22 happen, unforeseen human error, et cetera.

23 And primarily, I would just hope that those who
24 are making the decision on this keep it focused to safety
25 and the long-term vision, not jobs, and Australia's wanting

T001-29.1

T001-29.1

Section 1.1 contains information on the roles and responsibilities of the Project's decision-makers.

T001-29.2

Section 4.7.4 contains information regarding impacts on the marine environment.

T001-29.3

Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised information on public safety.

T001-29.2

T001-29.3

76

1 to sell LNG to us.

2 You know, I also feel like this is sort of a
3 short-term solution. LNG might be a cleaner burning
4 solution, as far as energy needs. However, in the long
5 term, LNG's going to run out, just like oil's going to run
6 out. And the environment is more important in the long
7 term, and the people's health is more important than a quick
8 fix to the current energy situation.

9 Thank you for your time.

10 (Applause.)

11 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Let me read ahead, the next
12 speakers are Elizabeth Anthony, Hayden Riley, and Barry
13 Haldeman, it looks like.

14 If you would like to speak, there are cards there,
15 you may have missed them on your way in. Here come a couple
16 more. And please sign up to speak.

17 Elizabeth Anthony.

18 MS. ANTHONY: Good evening, my name is Elizabeth
19 Anthony, I'm a Public Safety Commissioner here, in Malibu,
20 but tonight I'm not speaking in that capacity, I'm speaking
21 as an individual, a resident of Malibu, and a mother of
22 three kids, a resident of Point Dume.

23 I recognize that there are some legitimate
24 arguments in favor of this facility. There are certainly
25 legitimate arguments in favor of increased energy for

T001-29.3
(cont'd)

T001-29.4

T001-29.4

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTER
T001-30

1 California, especially a clean source, like natural gas.
2 There are certainly economic arguments in terms of jobs,
3 good jobs provided for the people who would be involved in
4 the construction of the facility.

5 However, I have to state my strong opposition to
6 the project. I think the no-action choice is the correct
7 action, and I'll explain why.

8 Once we impact the environment off our coast,
9 there is no going back. We will affect the marine
10 environment, we will impact the whales, the dolphins, the
11 sea lions. Everything that lives in the ocean will be
12 affected.

13 And it is unfortunate that the marine life does
14 not have a voice, that the whales and the dolphins cannot
15 come up and speak.

16 I would like to just urge you -- I'm getting
17 choked up thinking about the animals.

18 I would like to speak on behalf of all of us who
19 enjoy and respect the marine environment, that we cannot
20 afford to impact it in this way, even for a facility that
21 has so many things in favor of it. So I would urge that you
22 choose the no-action course.

23 Thank you.

24 (Applause.)

25 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Hayden Riley.

T001-30.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T001-30.1

T001-30.2

Section 4.7.4 contains information regarding impacts to the marine environment.

T001-30.2

1 MS. RILEY: Good evening. Hi, how are you.

2 I'm Hayden Riley, from Oxnard Shores, and I co-
3 host lngdanger.com. I am here as a private citizen. We
4 cannot take terrorism lightly, and the BHP EIR/EIS is
5 inadequate with its safety standards.

6 In 1977, the Oxnard EIR reported that, according
7 to the Bureau of Mines comparative models, showed an
8 ignitable plume would go 76 miles.

9 Also, in the 1977 EIR, the U.S. Coast Guard
10 comparative model showed it would go 28 miles.

11 On March 28th, 2004, in a Ventura Star editorial,
12 the BHP Manager admitted that a large release of gas would
13 take three to five miles to dissipate.

14 Now, the 2004 EIS claims it will go just 1.6
15 miles. Now, these are all theoretical calculations, so
16 which is right, is it the 76 miles, 1.6 miles, or somewhere
17 in between.

18 Science discovered electricity, light bulb, the
19 telephone, airplane, radio, television, we even landed on
20 the moon all before 1977. We were not stupid before 1977.
21 Science did not begin in 2004. In any event, the EIS must
22 rely on more than just scientific theoretical calculations.
23 There's too much at risk.

24 Currently, we have approximately 46 proposals
25 nationwide, and you still haven't conducted an actual, large

COMMENTER
T001-31

T001-31.1

Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on terrorism.

T001-31.1

Section 2.1 contains information on design criteria and specifications, final design requirements, and regulations governing the construction of the FSRU. The Cabrillo Port must be designed in accordance with applicable standards, and the U.S. Coast Guard has final approval. Section 4.2.4 contains information on Federal and State agency jurisdiction and cooperation. The Deepwater Port Act specifies performance levels that all deepwater ports must meet; Section 4.2.7.3 contains information on design and safety standards for the deepwater port. Section 4.2.8.2 contains information on pipeline safety and inspections. The EIS/EIR's analyses have been developed with consideration of these factors and regulations.

T001-31.2

T001-31.2

Section 4.2.3, the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C1), and the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories' review of the Independent Risk Assessment (Appendix C2) contain revised information on the 1977 Oxnard study.

T001-31.3

To date, there has never been a large spill of LNG to water. Conducting a large LNG spill to validate the models would result in adverse environmental consequences. However, models are commonly validated using experimental data. Section 2.3.4.2 of Appendix C1 contains information on tests executed by the U.S. Department of Energy and the calibration/verification of the Fire Dynamics Simulator model used in the Independent Risk Assessment. Appendix C1 provides additional information on this topic, and Appendix C2, prepared by the U.S. Department of Energy's Sandia National Laboratories, contains information on the review and assessment of the models used.

T001-31.3

1 LNG spill offshore. Your EIS must be based upon an actual,
2 large offshore spill test result. We don't want to trust on
3 mere computer models.

4 Last night, a BHP Consultant criticized the 1977
5 scientists who drafted the 1977 Oxnard EIR. I see him in
6 the audience, and he will probably attempt to do the same
7 thing again, tonight.

8 I am afraid that in 2010, your 2004 scientists
9 will be criticized after a catastrophic LNG disaster occurs.
10 Unless you conduct large-scale spills, you must err on
11 caution and deny the application.

12 Thank you very much.

13 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

14 (Applause.)

15 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: The next two speakers are
16 Barry Haldeman and Atossa Soltani.

17 MR. HALDEMAN: Good evening, my name is Barry
18 Haldeman, I'm a resident of Malibu.

19 The California Coast is a jewel of this State.
20 Many of us fight desperately to keep it safe and pristine
21 for humans and animals.

22 The Coast is environmentally, economically, and
23 emotionally important to all citizens.

24 To put this facility adjacent to a populated area,
25 with its attendant risks is, in my view, irresponsible and

T001-31.3
(cont'd)

T001-32.1

Section 3.3.7 contains information on the specific California locations considered in the alternatives analysis. The deepwater port would be 12.01 nautical miles (13.83 miles) offshore, as shown on Figure ES-1.

COMMENTER
T001-32

T001-32.1

1 insane.

2 California, in this area in particular, is
3 earthquake prone. All you have to do is live through a
4 couple of them, like I have, and maybe some of you have, to
5 realize the kind of damage that can be done.

6 I remind you, we're talking about the lives of
7 people here. We cannot afford to make a mistake.

8 Mr. Prescott, Mr. Ferris, Mr. Oggins, we are
9 looking to you to protect us. I urge you to extend the
10 period of comment so that we can all adequately respond to
11 the EIR. It's not -- let's not rush to judgment here. This
12 is simply too important of a decision.

13 Thank you very much.

14 (Applause.)

15 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Atossa Soltani.

16 MS. SOLTANI: Good evening. My name is Atossa
17 Soltani, I am a resident of Malibu.

18 I'm also here as the Executive Director of Amazon
19 Watch, a nonprofit organization, and a coalition called
20 RACE, Ratepayers for Affordable Clean Energy, which
21 represents over 20 organizations statewide.

22 Amazon Watch opposes the Cabrillo Port LNG
23 facility, because we challenge the underlying assumption
24 that this LNG is needed to meet our State's growing energy
25 needs.

T001-32.2

T001-32.2

Section 4.11.4 contains additional information regarding seismic risks and safety.

T001-32.3

T001-32.3

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

COMMENTER
T001-33

T001-33.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T001-33.1

T001-33.2

T001-33.2

Section 1.2.3 contains updated information on natural gas needs in California. Forecast information has been obtained from the California Energy Commission.

1 We are calling -- we're working at a California
 2 Public Utilities Commission, and calling for evidentiary
 3 hearings to assess whether or not LNG is needed in
 4 California. And we're calling on you to delay the approval
 5 of the EIR until the results of the evidentiary hearings are
 6 known.

T001-33.2
(cont'd)

7 Actually, last week, 26 members of Congress, U.S.
 8 Congress, sent a letter to the California Public Utilities
 9 Commission, also asking for an evidentiary hearing.

T001-33.3

10 We're also calling for you to analyze whether this
 11 project violates the spirit of the SB1078, that's the
 12 California's Renewable Portfolio Standards, that was
 13 approved calling for 20 percent of our energy needs be met
 14 by renewables by the year 2017, and by conservation.

T001-33.4

15 We're also asking that you look at the upstream
 16 impacts in the EIA. There's been a lot of discussion of
 17 whether or not this is a clean and environmentally-sound
 18 alternative. But often what's not being looked at is the
 19 upstream impacts.

T001-33.5

20 In the islands in Australia, places like the
 21 Amazon Rainforest, where there's natural gas going on for
 22 LNG, for California markets. Even though this project might
 23 not affect the Amazon Rainforest, it is affecting ecosystems
 24 in Australia. Does the EIA look at the upstream impacts.

25 The San Diego Tribune reported, a few weeks ago,

T001-33.3

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

T001-33.4

Section 4.10.1.3 contains information on this topic.

T001-33.5

Executive Order 12114, Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions, requires Federal agencies to consider the potential environmental effects of major Federal actions that could significantly affect the global commons outside the jurisdiction of any nation. Executive Order 12114 is not applicable to the extraction and development of natural gas in foreign countries.

An evaluation of the Project's environmental effects abroad must also be viewed within the context of section 15040 of the State CEQA Guidelines, which specifically defines and correspondingly limits the authority provided to State and local agencies under the CEQA.

The Applicant has stated that the source of the natural gas for this Project would be either Australia, Malaysia, or Indonesia. As these countries are sovereign nations, the Applicant would be required to comply with those countries' applicable environmental laws and regulations pertaining to the extraction and development of natural gas fields as well as those pertaining to the liquefaction and transfer of LNG to LNG carriers. Consideration of the Applicant's compliance with a foreign nation's applicable laws and regulations is beyond the scope of this EIS/EIR.

The Applicant has indicated that the Scarborough natural gas field in the state of Western Australia could be a potential source of natural gas for the Project. In May 2005, the Honourable Ian Macfarlane, the Australian Federal Minister for Industry, Tourism and Resources, stated, "Development of the Scarborough Field and related support facilities must be carried out in accordance with applicable laws and regulations of both the Australian Government (federal) and the State Government in Western Australia. Any activities will be subject to assessment and approvals under the applicable environmental legislative regimes. These include, among others, the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (EPBC) Act 1999, governing matters of national environmental significance, and, under State legislation, the Western Australian Environmental Protection Act 1986. The objectives of the Commonwealth's environmental regulatory regimes are to provide for the protection of the environment and ensure that any petroleum activity is carried out in a way that is consistent with the principles of ecologically sustainable development." (Appendix L contains a copy of this letter.)

Section 1.3 has been revised to include information on Indonesian and Malaysian environmental requirements that would regulate impacts related to producing and exporting natural gas. All three countries have existing LNG liquefaction facilities.

1 that the whole gas production is -- U.S. gas production is
2 increasing, and that the Energy Commission expert, David
3 Mahl, was quoted as saying that there's actually a decline
4 in gas of anywhere from .5 to 1 percent.

5 So the only ones who are predicting a growth in
6 natural gas, are gas companies, like Semptra.

7 We really need more independent assessment before
8 moving forward with a project of this magnitude.

9 We also -- I also wanted to point out that there's
10 no discussion of the footprint, of the climate change
11 footprint of LNG. For every -- for every thousand cubic
12 feet of LNG, there's a lot of energy to bring it to us.
13 There's energy to freeze it to minus 260 degrees, to ship it
14 in tankers, to regasify it, and then to burn it.

15 Given that 30 percent of California's energy --
16 I'm sorry, 30 percent of California's CO2 emissions come
17 from natural gas, and given that LNG has embodied 20 percent
18 more carbon emissions in order to provide the same amount of
19 energy as a domestic source, we want for you to look at the
20 climate footprint.

21 And lastly, looking at energy efficiency. Of our
22 aging, single-cycle --

23 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Okay, thanks. Thank you
24 very much.

25 MS. SOLTANI: -- natural gas power plants in the

T001-33.6

T001-33.6

Section 1.2.3 contains updated information on natural gas needs in California. Forecast information has been obtained from the California Energy Commission.

T001-33.7

See the response to T001-33.4.

Sections 4.6.1.4 and 4.6.2 contain information on Project emissions of greenhouse gases and recent California legislation regarding emissions of greenhouse gases.

T001-33.7

1 State, that are single-cycle and could be 50 percent more
2 efficient. Thank you.

T001-33.7
(cont'd)

3 (Applause.)

4 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else who
5 would like to speak tonight, I've gone through the list of
6 all of my cards, before we move on to second helpings?

7 Some of you may not have been here when I made
8 that announcement. We like to go through and give everyone
9 their first opportunity. This meeting is scheduled,
10 however, to go until 9:30, so we have some time left.

11 If there are those of you who have already made
12 comments, and would like to add to those, this is your
13 opportunity to do that, now. Sure.

14 If you would not only state your name, but spell
15 it for the court reporter, I'd appreciate it. Oh, you do
16 have a card, thank you. Never mind.

17 Yes, if new people could provide us with cards,
18 that would be helpful, too.

19 MR. RILEY: Good evening, everyone. My name is
20 Tim Riley, I'm here as a private citizen. I attended the
21 two hearings yesterday. I did not speak at the first
22 hearing, I observed, and I did speak last night. And my
23 remarks tonight are not going to be similar.

COMMENTER
T001-34

24 I will disclose, my wife did speak last night, and
25 her remarks were very similar to what they were tonight.

1 And I'm only prefacing that just because I think
2 there should be full disclosure for everyone here, because I
3 want you to know what's going on down the coast, because the
4 reporting in the newspaper was a little askew.

5 Last night there was a rally of 150 people, very
6 loud, and there was a submission of approximately 125
7 speaker cards. It was due to end somewhere around 9:30, we
8 went on until 11:00, and the crowd petered out from fatigue,
9 I believe, as the night went on.

10 The Reporter who spoke for the Star, today, sat
11 next to me, and I know her, but she had to leave early to
12 get the press -- the news out to press. So she didn't see
13 the whole evening unfold. And her reporting was that the
14 comments were equally balanced.

15 I can tell you, an approximation, there was
16 probably 80 to 90 speakers, and probably 75 to 80 percent
17 were against the proposal.

18 Now, in the afternoon I would say they were pretty
19 evenly balanced. All the suits. It seemed to be -- like I
20 wore a suit, yesterday, I was one of three suits that was
21 against the BHP, and I guess all the suits in the afternoon
22 were on the clock and, of course, they appeared.

23 But I'm saying this because there's going to be a
24 final hearing on -- there's going to be a hearing on the
25 final EIR/EIS, and I think the pro-BHP's going to keep

T001-34.1

T001-34.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

1 growing, as I see it, because the sea captain was at both
2 hearings yesterday, and said the same thing. And the
3 students, I really admire their dedication, it's almost like
4 a Red Sox fan, they appeared at both hearings yesterday, and
5 tonight. Their remarks were rote. Tonight, I guess they
6 were a little fatigued, because they reduced it to "I'm for
7 BHP." I guess they got tired.

8 But what I'm concerned about is the ground swell
9 that's going to grow in this community, as BHP continues its
10 media blitz.

11 In Oxnard area we're getting, almost every other
12 day, slick brochures. On their website there's only like
13 five, six, or seven hyperlinks, and one of them is called
14 "Kid's Corner."

15 And I'm seeing more and more students come in.
16 They've done the demographics, they know we care about our
17 air, and they're selling this project like this fossil fuel
18 is the greatest thing since oxygen.

19 Last year, LNG provided one percent of the United
20 States' energy. Last year, wind power provided one percent
21 of the United States' energy.

22 And I'm not, standing to be a wind advocate. I'm
23 advocating that we, as a nation, have to start focusing on
24 American jobs, American know-how, start building, and
25 creating, and designing renewables to take our country into

T001-34.1
(cont'd)

T001-34.2

Section 1.2.3 contains updated information on natural gas needs in California. Forecast information has been obtained from the California Energy Commission.

T001-34.2

1 the future, so we don't have to be manipulated or rely upon
2 foreign fossil fuels.

T001-34.2
(cont'd)

T001-34.3
Section 4.2 and Appendix C contain additional and revised
information on public safety.

3 We love the Australians. I told you last night,
4 I'd welcome you to dinner. But not in my backyard, with
5 ultra-hazardous materials.

T001-34.3

T001-34.4
Section 1.2.4 contains information on this topic.

6 Crystal clear water, that's the other proposal
7 that will be in the pipeline, and you're going to be invited
8 to those hearings. They call it Crystal Clear Water Port.
9 They're actually going around Oxnard, selling it, almost as
10 if it's a desalination project.

11 So we have, according to the Prime Minister of
12 Australia, he claims that, on the steps after meeting with
13 Governor Schwarzenegger, that this project is worth 15
14 billion dollars for Australia.

15 This is not a matter of diplomacy, this is a
16 matter of money. Are we going to keep exporting American
17 dollars to foreign nations, only to be manipulated, or
18 vulnerable to manipulation, or are we going to start
19 building renewables.

T001-34.4

20 I'm so surprised at some of the people, I'm not
21 even going to say their names, that they would be suckered
22 into natural gas as the clean way to go. It's a fossil
23 fuel.

24 (Applause.)

25 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Is there anyone who would

1 like to speak for the first or second time? If you'd like
2 to come forward. Sure, go ahead. Just state your name one
3 more time.

4 MS. SOLTANI: Atossa Soltani. I just had two
5 additional points to make, that I wasn't able to finish.

6 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Okay.

7 MS. SOLTANI: One is about the cost of LNG. I
8 know it's not in your purview to look at -- you're looking
9 at siting issues, and safety issues, and not cost.

10 But it's important to note that, currently, the
11 California Public Utilities Commission is considering a rule
12 for long-term natural gas purchasing contracts, that would
13 allow that cost of these expensive LNG plants to be passed
14 on to ratepayers.

15 And I think it is up to us, in the public
16 interest, to look at the cost alternatives of other sources
17 of fuel, whether it's conservation alternatives, renewables,
18 or the other domestic sources of natural gas.

19 And I just wanted to finish that stat I wanted to
20 tell you about, which is at least 15 power plants in
21 California were built in the forties and fifties, that are
22 over -- that use single cycle -- single cycle engines and
23 are very inefficient. They could be 50 to 70 percent more
24 efficient by being retrofitted to combined cycle.

25 And I think that if we were to look at that as an

COMMENTER
T001-35

T001-35.1

T001-35.2

T001-35.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T001-35.2

Section 3.3.3 discusses why retrofitting existing power plants with more efficient natural gas turbines is not a feasible alternative to the proposed Project.

1 alternative, of how much it would cost as an investment, how
2 much it would yield in terms of extra energy, we would find
3 that it would be comparable to what this plant can
4 deliver -- this terminal would deliver on an annual basis.
5 And it would be in the public's interest, it would reduce
6 our climate footprint, and it would contribute to our
7 economy.

T001-35.2
(cont'd)

T001-36.1

Section 4.4 contains information on this topic.

8 So I just wanted to make those additional points,
9 thank you.

10 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: I have a new card for
13 Damusa Larsen.

14 MS. LARSEN: This is my first time and, obviously,
15 I don't have anything really prepared. But I'm an emotional
16 homeowner here, and from a family who used to own four
17 Explorers, and now have to Prius's, and only one Explorer, I
18 have to say that -- oh, also, and solar panels on the house,
19 okay. We are going all conservation-wise because we don't
20 want to be caught up in needing to rely on fossil fuels.

COMMENTER
T001-36

21 We live on the coast, we look out to the ocean all
22 the time. I see the ports that are backed up here, with
23 ships in the lanes, more than I've ever seen before. It's
24 distracting, it's unattractive.

T001-36.1

25 We live in Malibu for the nature, for the hiking

1 trails, for going down to the ocean and enjoying the
2 atmosphere that's around.

3 We're going to be able to see the tank, from what
4 I understand, we're going to have more shipping -- ships
5 going out there. It is not going to be an attractive site.
6 It's going to reduce property values.

7 You know, you want to put it to money-wise, it
8 could have a lot of impact on what we see.

9 My concern, mainly, for coming here, is the
10 underwater animals. Okay, we had one person here saying she
11 wants to represent the animals that are under the water.
12 Just because we don't see the life that's below the level of
13 the ocean, doesn't mean it doesn't exist.

14 We have festivals for whale-watching. We have
15 friends that come to our house to watch, from our windows,
16 as the whales go by. Are they going to still come by after
17 we have this vessel hanging out there, with all the noise,
18 and everything else. Is it going to divert them, are they
19 going to start coming up onto shore?

20 You have all these plants all over, okay. I ask
21 Mr. Shipping Guy, back there, to find me somewhere inside
22 your document where you have all the environmental impacts
23 of all those other locations around the world.

24 There's nothing in there. He couldn't find
25 anything. Maybe there is, but we couldn't find it, and he's

T001-36.1
(cont'd)

T001-36.2

Section 4.16.1.2 contains updated information on property values.

T001-36.3

Section 4.7.4 discusses this topic.

T001-36.2

T001-36.4

All deepwater port applications fall under the authority of the Deepwater Port Act, which requires that a decision on the application be made within 330 days of the publication of the Notice of Application in the Federal Register. The Notice of Application for the Cabrillo Port Project was published in the Federal Register on January 27, 2004. Although the comment period (53 days) could not be extended at that time, a March 2006 Revised Draft EIR was recirculated under the CEQA for an additional public review period of 60 days. Section 1.4.1 contains additional information on this topic.

Section 1.5 contains information on opportunities for public comment. After the MARAD final license hearing, the public will have 45 days to comment on the Final EIS/EIR and the license application. The Federal and State agencies will have an additional 45 days to provide comments to the MARAD Administrator. The Administrator must issue the Record of Decision within 90 days after the final license hearing. The CSLC will hold a hearing to certify the EIR and make the decision whether to grant a lease. The California Coastal Commission will also hold a hearing. Comments received will be evaluated before any final decision is made regarding the proposed Project.

T001-36.4

1 on your side. Okay, so tell me how come we don't have more
2 environmental impacts published from all those occasions.

3 Okay, that's basically it. I think you need to,
4 you know, put this off, give us more information to make us
5 satisfied that you're not going to change the way things
6 are. It's already tedious.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. STERN: Andy Stern, once again. Can you hear
9 me?

10 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Just lift the mike up over
11 there. There you go.

12 MR. STERN: I'll lift it up a little bit.

13 There's something, that I've been listening to all
14 the speakers, obviously, and all due respect to the Counsel
15 General of Australia, who talked about jobs, who talked
16 about trade balance, and stuff like that, and the other man
17 who talked about jobs for the unions, I don't think that's
18 relevant.

19 I think, solidly, everyone I think, that you've
20 heard, who's in what I would call the danger zone, all of
21 the residents in this area, and people have driven down from
22 Oxnard, are solidly and completely against this project.

23 And I would hope that you don't look at the
24 economics, I would hope that you strictly look at the
25 environmental impact to all of us in the line of fire.

T001-36.4
(cont'd)

T001-37.1

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

COMMENTER
T001-37

T001-37.1

1 Thank you.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. ADALIAN: Hi, I'm Karine Adalian. I'm back,
4 like a bad penny, I'm sure some of you feel.

5 In addition to some of the other things that
6 you've heard me mention, that I've done in my career, I've
7 also run a marketing department. And we've created
8 beautiful brochures, just like this, with little charts, and
9 pretty pictures, and we've talked with the press, and we've
10 told our stories, and we've talked with equity analysts, and
11 also told our story to people who are going to influence
12 where money got invested in pension funds, and other mutual
13 funds, and those types of things.

14 Obviously, there's a profit motive here. And as I
15 mentioned last night, I have family, relatives in Australia.
16 And the last time I was in Australia, the day that I flew
17 back, was the day that TWA Flight 800 crashed off Long
18 Island East *Murrages.

19 Now, when I got my MBA at NYU, the first year that
20 I was there, which was 1995, '96, we studied the global
21 airframe manufacturing, engine, and airline industry,
22 because it was a strategically important industry to the
23 United States.

24 And energy is obviously very important to the
25 United States.

COMMENTER
T001-38

T001-38.1

T001-38.1

Table 4.2-2 and Sections 4.2.6.1 and 4.2.7.6 contain information on the threat of terrorist attacks.

T001-38.1
(cont'd)

1 And when we were actually at Boeing, we asked them
2 why do you engineer planes the way you do? You over-
3 engineer them, they're more heavy, they take more energy to
4 fly, whereas, Air Bus, your competitor, lighter planes, cost
5 less to operate, well, we obviously don't want to have any
6 accidents.

7 TWA Flight 800 was a 747, and 747s are only
8 manufactured by Boeing. I don't know whether it was human
9 error, or what, that brought that plane down, but there's
10 been several human error type events that have happened
11 that, as I've said before, I don't think you can control
12 for.

13 There's a large population here, the economics of
14 what happens in the Southern California region, which drives
15 the economy in California, which California, as somebody
16 last night, I think, mentioned, as California goes, so does
17 the nation.

18 I don't think we can stand something like what
19 happened in Lower Manhattan to happen here. Because the
20 economic impact to Lower Manhattan, everything South of 14th
21 Street was closed down for weeks, while they sorted through
22 those buildings that were supposed to stand up, stand up to
23 a plane flying into them. But just not the size that they
24 had actually flown into them. Full of fuel, of fossil fuel,
25 that burned those things. Those buildings were supposed to

1 stand and they did not.

2 And even though they had trained first-responders,
3 they had the bunker in the World Trade Center to be able to
4 deal with that, we were on our own, having to deal with how
5 to get out of the way, ourselves, using our own judgment.

6 Now, in Oxnard, one of the great things about
7 Oxnard is like New York, it's very diverse. How many
8 languages are spoken there? It's not just Spanish. There
9 are Filipinos, there are Japanese, there are Chinese. Are
10 we translating the materials, these beautiful materials into
11 Chinese, Japanese? I only saw them in Spanish. How are we
12 going to explain to them that, you know what, Homeland
13 Security says go get some duct tape and plastic, and cover
14 up your windows in the event of a terrorist attack. That's
15 what we were told in New York.

16 I had friends who didn't open their mail because
17 we had anthrax coming through the United States Post Office,
18 behind Penn Station. The main post office in New York.

19 And they -- and the officials, the supposed ones,
20 who were supposed to be looking after us, kept the post
21 office open, kept the mail going through there, so that we
22 could get our bills on time. But meanwhile, how many of the
23 people that were actually working at the post office, in
24 their union jobs, were being exposed to anthrax?

25 I don't think we've taken into account enough

T001-38.1
(cont'd)

1 about what the terrorist threat could be to Southern
2 California.

3 One of our allies, thank God we have them, Canada,
4 stopped the Millennium Plot to do something to LAX, because
5 she was alert, the border patrol person.

6 There have already been people who have been after
7 the L.A. area to be able to do damage here, and we're just
8 putting a target, with a big bull's eye around it, out in
9 the water, to affect us economically, from a health
10 standpoint, from a safety standpoint, from air, water,
11 marine life. I don't think you've taken into account a
12 serious threat to this community.

13 Thank you.

14 I do have one other statement. Cy Oggins has said
15 if you want your voice to be heard, be sure to e-mail him
16 with your written comments. I would also add to that,
17 please, please write to your elected officials, stating your
18 opposition against this program. Thank you.

19 (Applause.)

20 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else who
21 would -- we do have another speaker. Did you fill out a
22 speaker card?

23 MS. HASTINGS: I did not. Can I do it afterwards?

24 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Okay, on your way out,
25 sure.

T001-38.1
(cont'd)

T001-38.2

In accordance with NEPA and the CEQA regulations, the lead Federal and State agencies have responded specifically to all comments, both oral and written, that concern the Project's environmental issues received during public comment periods. All comments and responses are included in the Final EIS/EIR.

T001-38.2

1 MS. HASTINGS: Good evening, thank you for letting
2 me speak. My name is Nancy Hastings. I do --

COMMENTER
T001-39

T001-39.1

Section 4.11.1.5 contains information on sand migration. Impact
GEO-1 in Section 4.11.4 addresses scour resulting from Project
construction.

3 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Can you spell that for us,
4 since we don't have a card?

5 MS. HASTINGS: N-a-n-c-y, last name is Hastings,
6 H-a-s-t-i-n-g-s.

T001-39.2

Section 4.7.4 discusses this topic.

7 I do work for an ocean conservation group, but
8 this evening I'm speaking as a private citizen.

T001-39.3

Section 4.18.4 discusses this topic.

9 This year, two major reports were released. One
10 was a government-funded report, the U.S. Commission on Ocean
11 Policy, and a privately-funded report, the *PU Oceans
12 Commission.

T001-39.4

Section 4.7.4 discusses this topic.

13 There was a surprising consensus from both reports
14 that the state of our oceans are in a state of crisis.

15 I believe, personally, although I've not read, in
16 detail, the draft EIS/EIR, I hope my organization will
17 submit comments to you, that this LNG Port has numerous
18 impacts to California's priceless ocean resources.

T001-39.1

19 From the perspective of an ocean enthusiast, a lover of
20 Malibu's coastline, and a surfer, some of the impacts that
21 are important to me have to do with sand migration and scour
22 at Ormond Beach, the crushing and displacement of benthic
23 communities along the pipeline during construction, the
24 increase of turbidity and changes in water quality, lights
25 and noise to those who live underwater, permanent and

T001-39.2

T001-39.3

T001-39.4

1 temporary areas that may be restricted to access on the
 2 beach, the affects of the failures on humans, and marine,
 3 and terrestrial ecosystems, the impacts from construction or
 4 operation on wetlands or other habitats, and sensitive
 5 species within the proposed pipeline landing and corridor,
 6 increases in shoreline erosion during construction and
 7 operation, and impacts on marine resources, overall, off the
 8 Coast of Oxnard, and especially the Channel Islands Marine
 9 Sanctuary, which we've just spent so much time and effort
 10 protecting those marine communities. It would be a shame to
 11 have them impacted.

12 So I do support Ozzie Silna, and many other people
 13 here, who support aggressive conservation, seeking out ways
 14 to use alternative fuels. I support the no-action
 15 alternative.

16 And lastly, I heard a lot of concern from people
 17 who say that the community may not be aware of these things,
 18 or may not be able to participate. And it's shocking to me,
 19 in the year 2004, with all the technology we have, that we
 20 can transport LNG from Australia to here, but yet we don't
 21 use the technology available to webcast these meetings, so
 22 those who are unable to attend, or who would have preferred
 23 not to drive, could have still participated and stay
 24 informed. Thank you.

25 (Applause.)

T001-39.5

T001-39.6

T001-39.7

T001-39.8

T001-39.9

T001-39.10

T001-39.5

Section 4.2.7 contains information on potential public safety impacts from the FSRU and LNG carriers and mitigation measures to address such impacts. Sections 4.15.3 and 4.15.4 discuss this topic.

T001-39.6

Sections 4.7.4 and 4.8.4 contain information on impacts on marine and terrestrial biological resources.

T001-39.7

Section 4.8.4 discusses potential impacts on wetlands and other habitats and on terrestrial species. Section 4.11.3 discusses erosion during Project construction.

T001-39.8

The FSRU would be located outside of the current boundary of the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary (CINMS) and vessels associated with Cabrillo Port operations would not be expected to enter the CINMS. Sections 4.7.1.4, 4.13.2.2, and 4.20.1.5 discuss the potential expansion of the CINMS boundary, which is not proposed at this time. Sections 4.7.4, 4.15.4, 4.16.4, and 4.18.4 describe potential impacts on the marine environment and proposed mitigation measures to reduce those potential impacts.

T001-39.9

Your statement is included in the public record and will be taken into account by decision-makers when they consider the proposed Project.

T001-39.10

Section 1.5 contains information on the public review and comment opportunities provided by the lead agencies in full conformance with the provisions of the law. Both the CSLC and MARAD/USCG have met or exceeded the public notice requirements for this

Project (see Sections 1.5.1 and 1.5.3).

1 MODERATOR MICHAELSON: Is there anyone else?

2 MR. PRESCOTT: Thank you very much for your
3 patience in waiting to speak. We appreciate all the candid
4 remarks.

5 At this time, we will basically take a recess. We
6 had indicated the meeting would be open until 9:30. In the
7 event that someone is currently enroute, and anticipating it
8 being open at 9:30, we don't want to close in the event of
9 that.

10 So we're going to take a recess. If someone shows
11 up in the next 20 minutes, requesting to speak, we'll
12 receive their comments.

13 I want to remind everyone, as we had said, written
14 comments carry the same weight, and you can submit those by
15 December 20th. Information for doing that should be at the
16 table. Thank you.

17 (Thereupon, a recess was taken.)

18 MR. PRESCOTT: Okay, it's now 9:30, we've received
19 no further comments. At this time, the meeting is
20 adjourned. Thank you.

21 (Thereupon, the December 1st
22 meeting and public hearing
23 concerning the Cabrillo Port
24 Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater
25 Port, was adjourned at 9:30 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, RONALD J. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Department of Transportation, and California State Lands Commission public hearing on the Cabrillo Port Liquefied Natural Gas Deepwater Port was recorded by my staff, thereafter transcribed into typewriting, and personally proofread by me.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties in this matter, nor in any way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 6th day of December, 2004.

Ronald J. Peters

Certified Shorthand Reporter

License Number 2780

Certified Manager of Reporting Services

Registered Professional Reporter

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345